representative, Gaffur Saib, declined to meet the demand on the ground that the land was still in the enjoyment of 2nd respondent Ameer Sab. The endorsement made to this effect bears *inter alia* the attestation of "Khatedar Linga." As the arrear remained undischarged, the land was forfeited and ordered to be sold. The sale took place on the 21st November 1903, with the result that the appellant became the purchaser. The sale was duly confirmed on the 25th April 1904 and possession given to the appellant on the 26th August 1904. In the meantime, *i. e.*, several months subsequent to the date of the sale, the patel received the arrears from the 2nd respondent in two instalments on the 13th March 1904 and 12th April 1904, respectively. On the representation of the 2nd respondent made on the 5th August 1904, the Deputy Commissioner set aside the sale on the 12th December 1904. Hence this appeal.

2. Government are clearly of opinion that there were no sufficient grounds to justify the cancelment of the sale. The Deputy Commissioner's order is based on certain irregularities which were either non-existent or immaterial. There can be no doubt that though not entitled to a notice, the 2nd respondent did receive one long before the date of forfeiture and sale. He then contested his liability by alleging a sale in favor of a third party. His subsequent action was a complete reputation of that contention. His explanation that he declined to pay under the impression that the demand related to some other land which he had conveyed to Chowrabi, cannot be accepted as satisfactory and must be rejected as an afterthought. Having been given an opportunity of satisfying the demand and deliberately and under a false pretext failed to avail himself of it, it was not afterwards opened to him to turn round and assert that he was entitled to have the sale cancelled inasmuch as the patel had received the arrear from him shortly before the date of confirmation of the sale. The patel knew that the sale had been held in November 1903. The receipt of payment by him from the 2nd respondent partly in March and partly in April following, was a wholly unauthorized proceeding which could not be relied upon as helping the 2nd respondent's case in any way. The objections taken to the sale were none of them worth serious consideration. The khist payable in February 1903 fell into arrears and the notice was issued in March 1903. The non-mention of the year after the month of default was too trifling an omission to merit any serious notice. The same remark applies to the omission of the date of service and the enjoyer's name in the patel's endorsement under the notice. The person "Khatedar Lingegowda" whose attestation appears under Gaffur Saheb's statement was presumably the deceased defaulting occupant's son and namesake. The genuineness of the statement is not disputed, and an unimportant and inadvertant misdescription of one of the attesting witnesses does not in any way affect the validity of the proceedings connected with the sale, when the 2nd respondent was not entitled to a notice of demand, much less was he entitled to have the sale proclamation served on him. The land being situate in a bechirakh village and the first sale having proved infructuous for want of bidders, the second sale impugned by the 2nd respondent was held in a populated village only a furlong or two from the first mentioned village. This surely was not so grave an irregularity as to warrant the cancelment of the sale. It is not seriously contended that there was a paucity of bidders in consequence of this change of *venue*. No importance deserves to be attached to the objection that the record makes no mention of the hours of the commencement and close of the sale. These observations dispose of nearly all the points urged in support of the Deputy Commissioner's order. There remains to be dealt with the single argument that the price realised at the sale was inadequate. This *per se* does not justify any interference with a sale held in accordance with law and long since confirmed and given effect to. In short, the sale was a perfectly valid transaction and the 2nd respondent has himself to thank for the loss of a land in which he seems to have had some interest which he could easily have protected if he had been so minded. His conduct disentitles him to any treatment of the kind shown to him by the Deputy Commissioner on grounds both insufficient and inadmissible.

3. Under these circumstances, the Deputy Commissioner's order will be reversed, and that of the Assistant Commissioner reaffirmed and restored.

Memo No. R. 9559—R. M. 766-04-4, dated Bangalore, the 13th January 1906.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District, together with the records received with his letter No. 337, dated the 19th September 1905.

Appeal No. 41 of 1905-06.

Appellant	*vs.*	*Respondent*
Tirumalachar, (son of Alasingrachar) of Kaggere village, Kunigal Taluk.		Narayana Rao.

Subject.

Appeal gainst the order of the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District, cancelling the sale held for the arrears of revenue of Survey No. 3—2 of Nademavinapura Anehanta, Kunigal Taluk.

The facts of the case appear sufficiently from the following:—

Decision.

The land in question stood registered in the name of one Alasingrachar. A default having occurred in the payment of the assessment due thereon the land was forfeited and brought

to sale after due notice to the defaulting occupant. Before the date of sale, however, the Taluk authorities ascertained, with reference to previous correspondence, that the respondent was interested in the continuance of the occupancy. They accordingly sent him a copy of the order of forfeiture and of the notification of sale. Before these could be returned, however, a sale was held with the result that the defaulter's son, the appellant, became the purchaser. Within a few days after the sale and long before action could be taken in regard to its confirmation, the respondent appeared before the Amildar and paid up the full amount of the arrears due. The Amildar was of opinion that the sale had been brought about by a fraud on the part of the defaulter and his son, and that the respondent had a valid grievance. The Deputy Commissioner accepted this opinion and refused to confirm the sale. Hence this appeal.

2. Admittedly the respondent had paid the kandayam of certain previous years. He had also, in May 1904, applied to have his name entered in the register maintained for the purpose under Rule 40 of the Rules under the Land Revenue Code (*vide* application produced before Government by the respondent). That application though duly stamped with the Court-fee of one rupee, was returned on the ground that it had not been accompanied by a fee of one rupee in cash. Whether this was correct or not, it is clear that the Taluk authorities knew that the respondent had an interest in the land and had paid its assessment in previous years. It was for this reason that they sent him certain processes. Having done so, they should have waited until the return of those processes, duly served. The sale was a suspicious transaction. It was not confirmed and given effect to. The appellant has no valid complaint. Government see no reason to interfere with the Deputy Commissioner's order appealed from.

3. Under these circumstances, Government direct that the appeal be rejected.

Memo No. R. 9482—R. M. 111-05-6, dated Bangalore, 12th January 1906.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District, together with the records received with his letter No. 376, dated the 9th October 1905.

Appeal No. 54 of 1906.

Appellant	*Vs.*	*Respondent*
Neelakantaiya (is dead) son Yellappaiya.		Gali Hanumantaiya.

Subject.

Claim in respect of vacant Government land No. 149 of Kasba Kolar.

The facts of the case appear sufficiently from the following :—

Decision.

A piece of land belonging to the appellant was acquired in 1895 by payment of compensation and added on to the bed of the Kolar Amanikere tank. In 1903, the respondent applied for a portion of it on the ground that it was not actually within the water-spread of the tank. This allegation was on inspection ascertained to be a fact. There was thus nothing to prevent the land being duly assessed and granted for cultivation. In exercise of the discretion vested in him by Rule 41 of the Land Revenue Rules, the Deputy Commissioner granted the occupancy to the Respondent on payment of a price fixed by him. The appellant subsequently asked that the land be given to himself in preference to the respondent. This the Deputy Commissioner declined to do. Hence this appeal. Government are not prepared to hold that the Deputy Commissioner exercised his discretion so unjudiciously and arbitrarily as to call for their interference. The grant has already been given effect to. The appellant has no claim properly called. The Deputy Commissioner might have given him the first refusal or ordered a public sale, but he was not bound to do so. Government are not satisfied that sufficient grounds exist for the cancellation of a grant formally made and duly effectuated.

The appeal fails and is accordingly rejected.

Memo No. R. 9385—R. M. 232-05-2, dated Bangalore, 11th January 1906.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District, together with the records received with his letter No. 525-42, dated the 21st July 1905, to the address of the Revenue Commissioner.

B. K. VENKATA VARADA IYENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Dept.